



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/050,182 03/26/98 OHNUMA

H 07977/242001

SCOTT C HARRIS
FISH & RICHARDSON
4225 EXECUTIVE SQUARE SUITE 1400
LA JOLLA CA 92037

IM62/0327

EXAMINER

KUNEMUND, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1765

DATE MAILED: 03/27/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/050,182

Applicant(s)

Ohnuma et al

Examiner
Robert Kunemund

Group Art Unit
1765



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 22, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-74 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 60-74 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 10

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1765

Newly submitted claims 60-74 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The newly submitted claims 60-65 require the formation of a layer of catalyst material which is a different and distinct process than that which was originally claimed. The metal in the original claim was not in the form of a layer. Further, the newly submitted claims require the formation of gate electrode below the silicon layer and formed prior to annealing which is a different process than that which was originally claimed, noting, gate electrode formation was not part of claim 1. Claims 66 to 74 all set forth a specific device. However, each of the devices set forth require materials and processing steps not originally claimed. For example, there is a multitude of steps in order to form a personal computer then deposition, heating and patterning as instantly set forth.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 60-74 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

The Rejections

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Application/Control Number: 90/050,182

Art Unit: 1765

Claims 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 49, 51, 57 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly submitted claims contain material not found in the originally filed specification. There is no support in the specification for the plasma doping of the group 15 metal as claimed. Further, there is no teaching in the specification that teaches that the concentration of phosphorus is a digit higher than the group 15 metal concentration.

Claims 35, 38, 41, 44, 51, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The claims states a digit difference however, there is no statement of which digit in the concentration amount is being referred to by the claims.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

Application/Control Number: 90/050,182

Art Unit: 1765

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 to 59 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 5,700,333. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference is the device formed and heating. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable device formed as the instant claims form any device and heating in order to decrease heating time.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 90/050,182

Art Unit: 1765

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 to 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (5,700,333)..

The Yamazaki et al reference teaches a method of device formation. On a substrate, a layer of amorphous silicon is deposited and then catalysts are placed in contact with the silicon. The silicon is heated in order to crystallize the silicon. Then a gettering agent is added to the silicon layer. Then the structure is reheated to remove the catalyst. The second heating step is around 550°C, note entire reference. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the device formed. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable types of devices made in the Yamazaki et al reference in order to create devices with low impurity silicon layer.

Claims 17 to 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (5,700,333) in view of Zhang et al (5,569,936)

Art Unit: 1765

The Yamazaki et al reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs from the instant claims in the use of lasers to crystallize the silicon. However, the Zhang et al reference teaches catalyst crystallization of amorphous silicon by using lasers, note figures. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Yamazaki et al reference by the teachings of the Zhang et al reference to use lasers in order to decrease the time of crystallization.

Response to Applicants' Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 22, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argument concerning the gettering in view of the references is noted. However, the references are not limited to gettering only the islands are instantly claimed.

The references set forth getting the areas to be crystallized which reads on patterning the getting.

Applicants' argument concerning the type of laser has been considered and not deemed persuasive. The Zhang et al reference does teach the use of pulse lasers in order to crystallize the amorphous silicon.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Kunemund whose telephone number is (703) 308-1091. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 to 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ben Utech, can be reached on (703) 308-3836. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-6357.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

RMK

March 24, 2000

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RMK', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

ROBERT KUNEMUND
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
A.U. 117